A. Interpretation: If the neg defends a counterplan, they must defend it unconditionally/dispositionally.

B. Violation

C. Standards

1. Strat Skew – the aff can never form a coherent strategy to answer the CP it can be kicked at any time in the round. If I spend time reading turns then he can just kick it for a positive time tradeoff but if I don’t answer it then it’s game over. Strat key to fairness because debaters can’t win rounds without a coherent strategy. Time skew key to fairness and o/w because it’s a pre-req to making args. Also unreciprocal because I have to defend the AC advocacy unconditionally which is key to fairness because it ensures debaters have to do the same amount of work to gain access to the ballot.

2. Ground- denies me a 100% ground because no arg can functionally answer the CP. Even turns and perms can just be kicked out of because its condo turning the CP into a free source of no risk offense that likely solves the aff and has specific net benefits that are reasons to prefer. Ground key to fairness because it’s the basis of all argumentation.

**AT condo is educational:**

1. turn: might be real world for me, but not the neg. No policymaker is also like “here are two bills that might work, but I’m only going to defend one of them in the end.” Policymakers advocate and sponsor particular pieces of single legislation.

2. no impact to real world policymaking – none of us will become members of congress or legislators in the real world, only about 500 people actually can.

3. turn: you kill educational clash elsewhere on the flow because you’re never incentivized to defend your arguments, just go for the one that is undercovered, which minimizes substantive engagement on real world issues since you don’t have to debate arguments that are challenging or nuanced. O/w your internal link to education since you can read different CPs in different rounds anyway – it’s just a question of what is better in already blippy time crunched LD debates.

**AT neg flexibility:**

1. turn: aff flexibility in the 1ar to engage with some sticking power is more important since I read the AC blind, whereas you could always craft the perfect counterplan to my aff – no reason why multiple counterplans are key to testing since you can just read the most nuanced one. neg flex is not important – side bias proves neg already wins more rounds than they should, so limiting neg strategic options is ok.

2. no uniqueness – you already get flexibility in the form of crafting theory interps, reading the most interactive NC or kritik. your interp provides no reason why multiple counterplans are uniquely key. Also dispo solves – you can defend the counterplan or the status quo if there are no turns, which means that my interp allows for flexibility anyway.